

T H E
S T A T E o f the C A S E
B E T W E E N
Mr. *B E D F O R D*
A N D
Mr. *C A T C O T T,*
In A N S W E R to Mr. *B E D F O R D's*
Examination, &c.

Ut omne genus scommatum & dipterorum in me conjiceret, ac sexcenta illius farinæ convitia in me sine modo & pudore congereret, quibus ille, totas scripti sui paginas implevit, miserasque chartas suffarcinavit atque commaculavit. — Melius fortasse fecisset Censor & famæ suæ consuluisse, si prorsus tacuisset, vel fortiora causæ suæ firmamenta protulisset — quanta ejus in me contumelia, quanta asperitas, quanta acerbitas, quantus livor, quantum odium ex Tractatu ipsius judicabit Lector — quæ me vel non spectant, vel ejusmodi sunt, ut responzionem non magnopere desiderent, praetereo. Capelli *præfatio in vindicias Arcani punctuationis.*

L O N D O N:

Printed by J. BETTEHAM:

And Sold by G. STRAHAN at the *Golden Ball* in *Cornhill*;
W. INNYS and R. MANBY at the West End of *St. Paul's*;
and J. WILSON in *Wine-street, Bristol.*

M. DCC. XXXVIII.



The STATE of the CASE between Mr. BEDFORD and Mr. CATCOTT.

MR. Bedford in his late Performance, having managed the Dispute between us in such a Manner as I shall not imitate, and wandered into Paths, where I shall not follow him, partly because I dare not make use of such Methods, as he has employed against me, and in which he is sure to get the better, partly because such Proceedings must render the Dispute endless: since were I to set right his manifold Perversions of my Meaning, (which a Man of Sense cannot, and a Man of Candour will not mistake) shew the Falseness of his Suggestions, and lay open the Designs of his Artifices, he might (since he thinks himself at Liberty to say whatever he pleases of an Adversary) draw out the next Charge, even beyond *Tently and Lastly*, and perhaps clap a dozen fresh Heresies on my Back: Or were I to explain the radical Meaning of every *He-*

bew Word, which he is pleased to drag into the Controversy, by affirming he cannot see how the Sense holds, when applied to such or such a Subject, he might proceed in the same Manner of finding new Matter for me to work upon, till we had gone through the whole *Hebrew* Bible. For these Reasons therefore I shall set the State of the Case before the Reader, as briefly as I can, and there let the Matter rest for the present.

I had asserted in my Sermon p. 9. that Elahim is “*a Name or Noun derived from Alah, which as a Verb, signifies to confirm by Oath, to bind a Person to fulfill certain Terms under the Penalty of a conditional Malediction;*” “*As a Name or Appellation, when applied to a Person, a Swearer to a Covenant; As a Noun, when expressive of an Action, an Oath: That it occurs about forty times in SS. and always in this Sense: That this Term was applied to those Persons who created the World,* Gen. i. i. ii. 4. That Jehovah Elahim occurred in innumerable

, Places

"Places in SS; That it was said,
 "Psa. xviii. 31. If. xlvi. 8. Who is Eloah
 "(a part. pass.) execrated but Jehovah?
 "So that from hence we were informed
 "that the Persons in Jehovah had, before
 "the World was made, performed an
 "Act, which had denominated them E-
 "lahim or Covenanters: That the Sub-
 "stance of this Covenant was to redeem
 "Mankind; which was to be effected by
 "the Sufferings and Death of the second
 "Person, for, and in the stead of Man,
 "in case Man fell.

To prevent Mistakes, and forestall those
 Charges which Mr. Bedford hath brought
 against me, in both his Performances, I
 said yet farther, "That indeed it was not
 "possible, either for them to falsify their
 "Obligation, or to suffer Penalty, but
 "that there was no other Word, by
 "which the Idea of this Transaction, be-
 "tween the Elahim, could be conveyed
 "to Man, but this. In my Answer I
 opened yet farther the Sense and Con-
 struction of Eloah, by shewing, both
 that it was, and why it was a Participle
 Passive, and was applicable to the second
 Person

Person only, because he only was to become actually execrated, or in St. Paul's Words, be made a Curse for Mankind; and for that Reason it never occurred in the plural Number; the Word *Elabim*, signifying Persons bound under a conditional Malediction, being always written without the Letter *Vau*. And to prevent Cavils, or being charged with Consequences, which I did not intend to make, I added (as I had before done in the Case of *Elabim* in the Sermon) "That Christ indeed, as he was Jehovah, could not suffer Pains or Penalties, any more than could the other two (by the way, this Expression shewed sufficiently that I spoke of a Trinity of Persons) "but yet the Person who was to become obnoxious to the Malediction, and the Man who actually underwent it, was Jehovah.

On the Sense of this Word *Alab*, was laid the Foundation of the Sermon, but I had taken in one or two collateral Proofs. I observed that the *Cherubim* was an Emblem of what the Persons in *Jehovah*, or the *Great Ones*, had obliged themselves to perform; and I affirmed (and

repeated the Challenge in my *Answer,*
 " That not one Text could be produced,
 " from whence it could be proved, that by
 " the Cherubim are meant an Order of
 " Angels. And I observed also, " That
 " of the Words which we find rendered to
 " make a Covenant, one always signi-
 " fied to cut, or to cut off, and the other
 " being of the root Bar or Barar, always
 " conveyed the Idea of Purification; and
 " I shewed from two Passages of SS.
 " Jer. ii. 22. and Mal. iii. 2. that Berith
 meant the Means of cleansing away
 Pollution: And I now add farther, that
 from these Texts the Sense is determined
 to be *active*, and not, as Mr. Bedford af-
 ferts, *passive.*

At the End of my Sermon, I referred
 my Reader for further Evidence, about
 the Sense of the Words and Things ex-
 plained in it, to a Treatise intitled, *Some
 Thoughts upon Religion, &c.* And were I
 to do so to the numerous Passages, where
 Mr. Hutchinson has produced such irre-
 sistible Testimony from the Hebrew SS.
 for the Sense of these Words, that I
 could not, nor can yet withhold my Af-
 sent

sent from what He and I have asserted about them, I might fill whole Pages. In the *Appendix* I stated the Case at large, why the inspired Writers in *Greek*, had used the same Words for *Elabim*, and others relating to the Oeconomy of Man's Redemption, as the *Septuagint* before had made use of in their Translation.

Now since *Mr. Bedford*, neither in his *Observations*, nor *Examination*, has produced one Text, where the Words *Alab*, *Carath*, and *Berith*, ever bear any other Signification, than that I have assigned to them; nor shewn one Instance (of his six hundred) where *Elabim* had a *Vau* in the plural Number; nor a single Passage from SS. in Proof that the *Cherubim* were *created Spirits*; nor offered one Word in Defence of his Interpolations and Alterations of the Sense of the Words used by *Ezechiel*, in his Description of the *Cherubim*; nor produced a single Objection to what I had advanced in relation to the *Septuagint* and the *New Testament*; nor taken any Notice of the additional Evidence, produced by *Mr. Hutchinson*, for the Sense of the Participle *Aloab*, nor offered

offered any Exception to the Distinction which, I shewed, was to be made between the Sense of *Alab* and that of *Nisbbang* and the Name *Rab*, or his farther Explanation of the *Cherubim* from the *Revelations*; nor, (so far as can be judged from both his Performances) so much as looked into the *Treatise* recommended to my Reader's Perusal, much less hath consulted Mr. *Hutchinson*'s former Works (which he not only ought to have done, but to have confuted what was therein advanced) from all this I say, 'tis plain, that the Dispute, so far as regards the Evidence produced from the *Hebrew SS.* stands exactly on the same footing as it did before he wrote his *Examination*.

The only new Argument produced in his last Performance (from p. 68. to 86.) is this, “*The horrible Consequences which attend the Doctrines, which Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Catcott have attempted to impose upon the World.*” Now this Argument put into Form runs thus: Doctrines that are attended with horrible Consequences of introducing Freethinking, Deism, and Heresies cannot be re-

vealed in SS. — But the Doctrines which Mr. H. and Mr. C. have attempted to impose upon the World, are attended with the horrible Consequences of introducing Freethinking, Deism, and Heresies; Therefore, the Doctrines, which Mr. H. and Mr. C. have attempted to impose upon the World cannot be revealed in SS.— Now this Way of Arguing is exactly the same as the *Romanists* made use of against the Reformers; They fled from the Evidence of SS. and laid to their Opponents Charge, *Love of Novelty and Singularity, Fondness of being Heads of a Party, and Pride*, and accused them of being guilty of the horrible Consequences of introducing Confusions and Heresies into the *Church of Christ*: Neither were they the first, who instead of confuting their Adversaries from SS. betook themselves to the Arts of Calumny, in order to make them appear odious to the World, and thereby to stop the Progress of Truth: There was a Time when the Publishers of the Gospel were accused of *Heresy*, and stiled *pestilent Fellows, and Movers of Sedition, and such as had turned the World upside*

upside down. But *Truth* did prevail, and will prevail.

But if such Clamours could have had any Effect, neither could Christianity have first made its Way into the World, nor could the Corruptions introduced into it since ever have been amended. Besides, if such sort of Argumentation be allowable, SS. can be of no possible use towards determining any Controversy: For a Man has no more to do, in order to overthrow the Assertions of an Adversary, than to give his Thoughts and Pen what Liberty he pleases, and affix such Consequences as he thinks most *horrible* to his Opponent's Opinion, and the Work is done.

Yet farther, if this be the Way to silence Arguments drawn from SS. those Writings can be of no Service to us, as they are a Rule of Action. For supposing a Clergyman should take upon him to reprove a Libertine, who called himself a Christian, and assure him that Fornication was condemned, and in case he could not abstain, Marriage was required of him, by the Laws of God; such a

Person might answer, that he was sure the Law of God could require no such Thing, because of *the horrible Consequences of Matrimony*; and then might as fluently go through the common-place Raillery of loose Men against that Institution, as Mr. *Bedford* hath carried on the Charge of Deism, &c. to the length of *ten Articles* against me. Now how is this Man to be answered? by following him Step by Step through all his Fallacies and Falshoods, or by producing the plain Words of SS. against him? Doubtless by producing the Words of SS. against him. Be this the Case between Mr. *Bedford* and me.

Quite through the whole Management of this Affair, he has declined, or endeavoured to invalidate the Evidence produced from SS. and our Side against his Assertions. Thus he will allow *Alab*, *Carath*, and *Berith* to signify what we say they mean in any other Part of SS. but they must by no Means do so, in the Texts produced by us in Justification of our Doctrines. But if this Arguing holds, (besides that it renders it impossible to recover the Sense of any Word, obscured by the

the *Jewish Interpretations*, and is manifest, that the *Hebrew Words* have no settled and determinate Meaning, and also is, in effect, saying, that they were used in such a Sense in one Passage, as may serve to mislead us in Matters of the greatest Moment in others, as I observed in my *Answer*) yet farther, how can we prove one Christian Doctrine to be true? Suppose Mr. *Bedford* were required to prove the Dominion of God, and he should attempt to do so from *Deut. x. 17.* “*Jebovah your El-*
“*him is Lord of Lords;* or if he chose rather to do so from Words used in the *English Translation*, as *the Lord God*, or *the Lord is God*, or *God is the Lord*, and it should be replied to him, in his own Words to me, “*That this might be allowed*
“*him, when the Word Lord is not joined*
“*to God, but not then;* or thus, “*That*
“*the Word signifies Dominion I*
“*readily allow, but then it always is*
“*spoken of Men and never of the blessed*
“*God.* Considering how he has forestalled himself from giving such an Answer as another Person might, by his own arbitrary Affections against what I produced from SS. I wonder what he would say. To

To what Purpose the Dissenters are so much as named by him in this Controversy, I cannot see, unless it be with an Intent of making this Dispute a *Party Matter*: if that be his Design, the Artifice is very mean, to say no worse.— But I am not surprised at his making use of it. However to prevent its making any Impression on any one; I here declare, that I never said, or wrote, or thought, that a Christian of any *Denomination* soever, professing himself to believe a Trinity of Persons (for that there were more than *three*, the Devil himself did never suggest) in *Jehovab*, and the true and proper Divinity, and Incarnation and meritorious Death of Christ, was an *Apostate*. It is true in my *Answer*, on a Supposal that there were several Hands concerned in the *Observations*, I did call for a more explicite Account of the Person's *Creed*, who wrote some Passages in that Book, than he had there given to us; but since Mr. *Bedford* hath taken wholly on himself the Composition of the *Observations*, and also given us an Orthodox Confession in his last Performance,

mance, I hereby retract the Charge; and moreover, had I used Mr. *Bedford*, (to whom I never in my Life gave any Provocation, and to whom I am not altogether unknown) in so rude a Manner, as he did me, I would have begged his Pardon publickly.

I shall conclude with this Syllogism, which will bring Mr. *Bedford* back to the Case in Point; it is but his own Argument inverted. To propose to the World such Doctrines as are expressly and *totidem verbis* revealed and asserted in the SS. can never be the Cause of introducing Freethinking, Deism and Heresy; but what I have said both in my *Sermon* and *Answer*, hath been to propose to the World such Doctrines, as are expressly, and *totidem verbis*, revealed in SS. Therefore, both what I have said in my *Sermon* and *Answer*, can never be the Cause of introducing Freethinking, Deism, and Heresy.

P. S. Though I did not at first intend to take any more Notice of the *Examination*, because every one who has read my *Answer* cannot but see, how Mr. *Bedford* has

has perverted or misrepresented my Meaning, quite through his last Performance, yet, lest he should say, that my Silence was owning the Charge, I shall add, what follows, as an Answer.

In several Places he blends Mr. *Hutchinson's* Words and mine together, in order to lay a common Accusation against both; though I had given my Reader to understand, in my *Answer*, p. 82. "That I
 " thought myself bound to defend nothing,
 " but what I had advanced myself; and though it is nothing to me in what Manner Mr. *Hutchinson* has expressed himself, yet it appears to me, that Mr. *Bedford* mispoints his Words, p. 9. on purpose to pervert his Sense, which is, I think, no other than, "the Devil ordained Ma-
 " boomet, or that *Mahomet* was the Mi-
 " nister of the Devil.

P. 8. He makes a Supposition that Mr. *H. and I worship the Devil*; a little lower, he finds fault with me, for supposing Mr. *H.* to be happy in the other World. Would his *Charity* have me send Mr. *H.* to the same Place, as he has destined for me; *Observations* p. 10. among the Devils and damned Spirits? P. 9.

P. 9. I know no one that denies the proper use of Lexicons and other Helps.

P. 14. To prove that *Alab* was applied to *Jehovah*, I cited *Deut. xxix. 12.* where the Text says, “*bis Oath*, i. e. “*Jehovah’s; and be made it this Day;* “*i. e. faith Mr. Bedford, this is called* “*the Oath of God, not because he was* “*the Swearer, but because he command-* “*ed the Israelites to pronounce Curses* “*(many days after) on Mount Ebal.*” What Band can hold this *Proteus*?

Ibid. He should have remembred that *my Patrons* were once *bis*, when he passed his unmannerly Reflection on them. But *I know* the reason of his Resentment.

P. 17. He says, *He searched the SS. with an humble Desire to be informed by them; and he (I) searched them with a Design to carp at them, that he might make himself the Head of a Party.* I said in my Answer, p. 83, 85. *That I could not see into Men’s Hearts, neither pretended to know what others thought.* It seems Mr. Bedford can.

P. 19. I had sufficiently proved the Sense of *Daber*, to be what I had given

it; to which he has returned no Answer.

P. 20. He confounds (on purpose) what I said of the *Jod* on one Occasion, with what I said of it on another.

P. 22. We must not insert Words, which alter the Sense of the *Hebrew Text*, as Mr. *Bedford* took upon him to do.

P. 25. He owns that *Elahim* is plural, and that it fitly represents a Plurality of Persons in *Jehovah*. But yet (says he) it may be fitly translated by a Word in the singular Number. Of this hereafter.

P. 29. I condemned the *Jewish Methods* of interpreting the SS. in the Introduction before the Text, and in the Body of the Sermon, and that was protesting against the Authority of their Grammars, Lexicons, &c.

P. 31, 32. I never allowed the *Hebrew Text* to be corrupted by the *Jews*; on the contrary, I asserted "That the Hand
" of *Jehovah* had kept them from altering
" the Letter of the Text.

P. 32. Our Saviour said *Elos*, singular, not *Elahim*, plural; the Man spoke to the second Person, who was confederate

with him to redeem Mankind, to whom he was personally united, and who was to be separated from the Manhood (or at least from the Body of *Jesus*) from just before his Death, to the Time of his Resurrection, which Separation was then immediately to ensue, when *Christ* spoke his last Words.

P. 33, 34. The last Argument produced by Dr. *Prideaux* proves, that the *Points* were not invented, till many Years after our Lord's Conversation upon Earth. Which when Mr. *Bedford* has answered, he is desired to refute what *Capellus* has advanced in his *Arcanum Punctuationis* and the *Vindiciae*, against the two *Buxtorfs*; the last of which has treated *Capellus* pretty much in the same Manner, as Mr. *Bedford* has used me.

P. 38. Let him prove, that by *Tittle*, is meant *one* of the *Points*.

Ibid. "Tis plain that I spoke only of the Obligation Preachers or Expositors of the Word of God lay under, to understand the *Hebrew SS.* What Mr. *Bedford* has said to me about the *Arabic*, he may apply to himself, as to the *Welſb.*

P. 39. 58. Though all that was necessary for Man to know, in order to support him after his Fall, was included in the *Cherubim*, yet the Explication of that mysterious Emblem, might be, and indeed was, made gradually ; each Generation of Believers, in Succession, being informed of what was proper for each of them to know, according to the Times in which they lived ; and indeed all the Promises were given, and the SS. written on purpose to explain what was therein contained ; nor was the Explication of every Part thereof entirely fulfilled, and committed to Writing, before St. John composed the *Revelations* ; and Christ could not explain the Hebrew SS. to his Disciples (as we know he did) without explaining some Part or other of that Exhibition.

P. 40. Mr. Bedford has not produced the Writings of one *Rabbi* so antient as St. Paul's Epistle to the *Galatians*, nor any Author in whom the Doctrines, which I spoke against, are extant, before *Philo* ; nor any who mentions the *Sadducees* as extant, before the Time
of

of our Saviour. He depends, he says, on Dr. *Lightfoot's Authority*, and I say, Dr. *Lightfoot's* depends on that of the *Rabbi's*, and that both together are not worth any thing. I demanded *authentic Evidence*, and told him before, I knew, as well as he, what used to be said on these Accounts.

P. 41. I had not forgot the Gospels, for I said they mentioned the *Sadducees*; but referred to the *Acts*, because there we have an Account of *one* Tenet more of the *Sadducees*, than we find mentioned in the Gospels.

P. 42. Though the Word *blessed* does not evade the Personality, yet the Word *one* does.

P. 46. I used the Word *is*, because it was in the English Translation; Mr. *Hutchinson* has observed, that there is no *Verb Substantive* in the *Hebrew*; and I had explained myself so fully in regard to the use of the Term *execrated*, that no one could mistake me, but *He* that had a mind to do so.

Ibid. Had they not been first *made naked*, they had had no need of being *cloathed*. *Ibid.*

Ibid. There are more Instances of the same manner of Formation, which he may look for if he pleases.

P. 48. The *Affixes* and *Prefixes* are Parts of, or Substitutes for *Pronouns*, and determine the Circumstances of Time, Person, Possession, and their Sense is not included in the Root, but super-added to it by their Conjunction with it, so that every Root so encreased, is truly a compound Word.

P. 49. He did not write *created Powers*, *by accident*, (as he says) but with design of making me seem to say what *Philo* does, and to bring a Charge against me, of allowing the *Cberubim* to have been *Spirits*, but not *created Spirits*. *Observations*, 27. & seq. *Answer*, 63.

P. 51. The Sense of Διαθήξη, as used by St *Paul*, has been given by Mr. *Hutchinson*, Use of Reason, 348, and by Mr. *Holloway* in his Sermon.

P. 54. Though Christ spoke the *Syriac Language*, yet he quoted the *Hebrew SS.*

Ibid. "Twas enough for me to prove, that *Fiscken* meant, thence forwards be inhabits.

P. 56.

P. 56. 58. Mr. Bedford's Proofs from the *Accidence*, and *Quæ genus*, and *Elements of Rhetoric*, and the Argument drawn from Noah's performing the same Office for the Beasts, &c. when they entered into Covenant with God, as Godfathers do for Infants at their Baptism, I have nothing to say to.

P. 64. I never once said, thought, or wrote, that the Knowledge and Profession of the Fundamental Points of Christianity were lost; nor that *the Gates of Hell should prevail against the Church*; but what I said was this, that though the Christians of the first Age understood the Hebrew SS. yet those of the succeeding ones neglected the Study of them; so that first, by losing the Knowledge of the Language, and afterwards by accepting the Jewish Rules and manner of interpreting them, they could not produce the Evidence contained in them for Christianity: As Mr. Hutchinson has more than once said, so say I, that as they believed, so they contested for the Fundamental Points of the Christian Doctrine; but could not produce the Original, genuine,

nuine, and decisive Evidence given on their side. And this is too true to be denied. Now the Evidence, which they could not produce, is that which we are endeavouring to recover.

P. 81. l. 21, 22. is entirely false. I meant the Evidence of the whole *Hebrew SS.*

P. 82. If it be so dangerous to render *Elahim* plural, *Gods* plural; then 'tis undeniably, that the Sense, which we put upon the Word *God* or *Gods*, cannot be the same as the *Hebrews* put upon *Elahim*: but sure it cannot be dangerous to give, in any other Language, the true Sense of a Word dictated in the *Hebrew* by the *Holy Ghost*. It is as daring a Presumption to make *Elahim* bear a Sense singular, as it would be to make *Jehovah* bear a Sense plural.

